

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

1 REMARKS

2 Objections to the Drawings

3 The Examiner has indicated that reference numbers 118a', 118b' and 120' are mentioned in
4 the description but are not included in the drawings. A formal replacement drawing for FIGURE 1B
5 that includes the reference characters "118a', 118b', and 120'" is submitted herewith. Accordingly,
6 the objection to the drawing should be withdrawn.

7 The Examiner has also indicated that the reference numbers 118 and 360 are
8 mentioned in the description but are not included in the drawings. Reference number 118
9 is now replaced in the specification (please see the Amendment to the Specification
10 section, above) by reference number "114" that is shown in FIGURE 1A. Reference number 360
11 is now replaced in the specification (please see the Amendment to the Specification section
12 above) by the phrase "not shown." Accordingly, the objection to the drawings should be
13 withdrawn.

14 The Examiner has also indicated that reference numbers 500 and 518 are included in the
15 drawings but are not mentioned in the description. Reference number "500" has been added to the
16 specification (please see the Amendment to the Specification section above). An incorrect referral to
17 reference number "516" in the specification has been replaced with reference number "518" (please
18 see the Amendment to the Specification section above). Accordingly, the objection to FIGURE 5
19 should be withdrawn.

20 In addition, reference number 321 designates the processing unit in the
21 drawings. Accordingly, an incorrect reference number "322" has been changed to "321" in the
22 specification to properly designate the processing unit. Please see the Amendment to the
23 Specification section above.

24 Objections to the Specification

25 The Examiner has objected to the specification because it recites "the method returns to
26 step 510" in reference to FIGURE 5, but FIGURE 5 shows that the method returns to step 508. The
27 specification as amended above now recites that "the method returns to step 508." Please see the
28 Amendment to the Specification section above. Accordingly, this objection to the specification
29 should be withdrawn.

30 ///

1 The Examiner has also objected to the specification because it recites "the method ends at
2 step 516," in reference to FIGURE 5, but FIGURE 5 shows that the method ends at step 518. The
3 specification as amended above now recites that "the method ends at step 518." Please see the
4 Amendment to the Specification section above. Accordingly, this objection to the specification
5 should be withdrawn.

6 The Examiner has objected to the specification for reciting the reference numbers listed in
7 paragraph 3 of the Office Action, which are not shown in the drawings. Please see the remarks
8 section "Objections to the Drawings." Since the drawings have been corrected to include these
9 reference numbers, the objection to the specification should be withdrawn.

10 The Examiner has objected to the specification for failing to recite the reference numbers
11 listed in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, which are shown in the drawings. Please see amendment
12 under the remarks section "Objections to the Drawings." Accordingly, the objection to the
13 specification should be withdrawn.

14 In addition, a punctuation mark has been added to the end of the paragraph on page 15, that
15 begins on line 12.

16 Status of the Claims

17 Claims 1-23 remain pending in the application, Claims 1-3, 8, and 10-13 having been
18 amended to correct stylistic errors and other non-substantive errors unrelated to the patentability of
19 these claims. Again, it is emphasized that none of the changes to the claims in any way relates to the
20 art cited by the Examiner in rejecting any claims.

21 Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Borland

22 The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-23 as being anticipated by
23 Russo Borland ("Running Microsoft Word 97," published by Microsoft Press, Redmond,
24 Washington 1997, hereinafter referred to as "Borland"). The Examiner asserts that Borland
25 describes each element of applicants' claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree for the
26 reasons discussed below.

27 In the interest of reducing the complexity of the issues for the Examiner to consider in this
28 response, the following discussion focuses on independent Claims 1, 13, and 22. The patentability of
29 each remaining dependent claim is not necessarily separately addressed in detail. However,
30 applicants' decision not to discuss the differences between the cited art and each dependent claim

1 should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur with the Examiner's conclusion that
2 these dependent claims are not patentable over the disclosure in the cited references. Similarly,
3 applicants' decision not to discuss differences between the prior art and every claim element, or every
4 comment made by the Examiner, should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur
5 with the Examiner's interpretation and assertions regarding those claims. Indeed, applicants believe
6 that all of the dependent claims patentably distinguish over the references cited. Moreover, a specific
7 traverse of the rejection of each dependent claim is not required, since dependent claims are
8 patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which the dependent claims
9 ultimately depend.

10 With regard to independent Claim 1, applicants' recited claim language
11 concerning the step of determining a sample of formats comprising a plurality of formats from a
12 format set is neither taught nor suggested by Borland. According to applicants' specification, a
13 "format set" is defined by a "color set" and a "font set" (see applicants' specification, page 4,
14 lines 19-20). A "color set" comprises a number of colors that if used together, create a
15 professional looking color scheme. For example, a "grape" color set may represent various
16 shades and hues of the color purple (see applicants' specification, page 4, lines 24-28). A "font
17 set" includes a number of fonts that work well within a given theme, such as a font set named
18 "hefty" that includes heavier fonts in various point sizes (see applicants' specification, page 4,
19 lines 20-24). It is from this format set that the method determines a sample of formats
20 comprising a plurality of formats.

21 The Examiner asserts that Borland anticipates the step of Claim 1 of determining a sample
22 of formats comprising a plurality of formats from a format set and cites the format "Styles" in the
23 figure on page 60. Step 1 on page 60 instructs the user to select the paragraph, paragraphs, or
24 text to which the user wants to apply the style. Then the user chooses the Format Style command
25 in step 2 and selects a style. But this section refers only to selecting a *single* style to apply to the
26 selected text; it does not refer to selecting a *set* of styles. It is a template having a rigid design
27 style such as described on page 60 that applicants' method wants to avoid. Applicants' method
28 seeks to provide a number of "format sets" to a user (see applicants' specification, page 4,
29 lines 12-13). Although step 4 instructs the user that a style can be selected from a different list of
30 styles, the user can still only make one choice from this list. Since applicants' method

1 encompasses the format set which comprises a color set and a font set, the format set is more than
2 a *single* font name, size, and color belonging to a style as Borland teaches. Thus, the step of
3 determining a sample of formats comprising a plurality of formats *from a format set* is neither
4 taught nor suggested by Borland.

5 Furthermore, with regard to independent Claim 1, applicants' recited claim language
6 concerning the step, for each format included in the sample of formats, reformatting the portion of
7 text with the format and displaying the reformatted portion of text in a live preview window, is
8 neither taught nor suggested by Borland. Applicants' method displays the same reformatted portion
9 of text for a given sample of formats all at the same time in the preview window. Thus, the user can
10 then preview and visualize how the different formats compare between the same portion of text (see
11 applicants' specification, page 8, lines 12-14).

12 The Examiner asserts that Borland anticipates this step and cites reformatted text in the
13 preview window in the Figure on page 61 of the prior art reference. However, step 2 on page 61
14 instructs the user to select a template, not a style. A template is not equivalent to a style. More
15 importantly, a template is applied to and only operates on an entire document. A template cannot
16 operate on only a portion of text that may be less than the entire document. On page 60, the
17 disclosure states that the Style Gallery provides a preview of your current document as it would
18 look with different styles applied if the user wants to experiment a little "*with the looks of all the*
19 *text at once.*" Although Borland teaches that a specific Style may be selected and that the
20 application will show the corresponding different reformatting applied to any sections of the
21 entire document that are assigned that Style, the preview window on page 61 only displays
22 changes for *all of the text* in the document resulting from applying a template to the document.
23 In contrast applicants' method displays different reformatting applied to the same portion of text
24 all at the same time. Thus, in applicants' method the user can then preview and visualize how the
25 different formats compare between the same portion of text (see applicants' specification, page 8,
26 lines 12-14) as opposed to Borland's method where it is much more difficult to visualize how the
27 different formats compare between different paragraphs of the entire text as shown in the figure
28 on page 61.

29 In the alternative, assuming, *arguendo*, that the Examiner intended to cite the figure on
30 page 60 as anticipating this step, with reference to a *style* that operates on select portions of text

1 as opposed to a template that operates on the entire document as shown on page 61, there are still
2 significant differences between Borland and applicants' method. As taught by Borland, if the
3 user wants to preview the selected portion of text with a different style applied, the user has to
4 then select another style and preview this single style in the preview window. As discussed
5 above, applicants' method differs in that it displays multiple formats of the same selected portion
6 of text in the preview window *all at one time*. This feature of applicants' claimed invention is
7 visually and functionally more desirable, in that the user can compare the differences in
8 formatting among the same portion of text on a single preview screen. Thus, Borland neither
9 teaches reformatting nor displaying a *portion* of text in a live preview window for each format
10 included in the sample of formats, e.g., each font in a set of fonts. Accordingly, the rejection of
11 independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Borland should be withdrawn for the reasons
12 given above.

13 Independent Claim 13 distinguishes over Borland for reasons similar to those expressed above
14 in connection with Claim 1. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of independent Claim 13
15 over Borland should be withdrawn.

16 Likewise, independent Claim 22 also distinguishes over Borland for reasons similar to those
17 expressed above in connection with Claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of independent Claim 22
18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

19 Because dependent claims are considered to include all of the elements of the independent
20 claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend and because Borland does not disclose or
21 suggest all of the elements of independent Claims 1, 13, and 22, the rejection of dependent
22 Claims 2-12, 14-21, and 23, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Borland should be withdrawn for at least
23 the same reasons as the rejections of Claims 1, 13, and 22.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

29 ///

30 ///

Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borland. However, Claims 2 and 10 depend from independent Claim 1, which is patentable for the reasons discussed above. And because dependent claims are considered to include all of the elements of the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend, dependent Claims 2 and 10 are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to independent Claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 2 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Ron Anderson

Kathy Davis

Replacement Formal Drawing FIGURE 1B